

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending in the present application, with claims 1, 12 and 21 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 5, 6, 7, 10, 12 and 21 have been amended to clarify the techniques of the invention. New Claim 24 has been added. Support for the claim amendments may be found in the specification at least at paragraphs 0028, 0044 and 0050 - 0053.

In the Office Action dated March 28, 2007, claims 1-4, 10-12, and 15-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over US Publication No. 2002/0069223 A1 (Goodisman) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0123912 A1 (Subramanian). Claims 5-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Goodisman in view of Subramanian and further in view of US Patent No. 6,222,537 (Smith). Claims 8-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Goodisman in view of Subramanian and further in view of US Patent No. 6,122,647 (Horowitz). Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Goodisman in view of Subramanian and further in view of US Publication No. 2002/0010769 A1 (Kippenhan). Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Goodisman in view of Subramanian and US Publication No. 2002/0010769 A1 (Kippenhan), and further in view of US Patent No. 6,222,537 B1 (Smith). Claims 21-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Goodisman in view of Subramanian and further in view of US Publication No. 2003/0080986 (Baird).

Telephonic Interview

Applicants' undersigned attorney wishes to thank Examiner Ries for the opportunity, on May 31, 2007, to conduct a telephonic interview on the pending Application and for her careful attention to the matter. During the interview, the applicants discussed amending claims to clarify that parsing by the helper object and parsing and identifying by the recognizer are performed locally. Agreement on specific claim amendments was not reached.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action dated March 28, 2007, claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over US Publication No. 2002/0069223 A1 (Goodisman) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0123912 A1 (Subramanian). Upon entry of the above amendment, claim 1 will recite:

A system for providing associated links in content viewable by a computing application configured to operate *on a local computer*, said computing application configured to generate requests to a *remote content server* and receive content from the server, the system comprising:

at least one helper object embodied in at least one computer readable medium *of the local computer* and configured to *operate on the local computer* to parse received content locally;

an associated links data file *residing in the local computer*; and

at least one recognizer embodied in at least one computer readable medium *of the local computer*, said recognizer configured to receive said parsed content and compare the parsed content with data from the associated links data file and to identify candidate associated links for association with the received content, wherein said parsing and identifying is *performed on the local computer*. (emphasis added)

The examiner contends that Goodisman describes a “recognizer, or pattern matcher, that cooperates with a linkify engine or helper object to compare the content with a predefined list of key-phrases and/or syntactic rules for recognizing key-phrase candidates.” Claim 1 as amended recites that the recognizer and helper objects are “embodied in at least one computer readable medium of the local computer” and operate or perform on a local computer. Applicants respectfully submit that Goodisman does not disclose that the recognizer and helper objects are embodied in or operate on a local computer.

As the examiner admits, “Goodisman does not expressly teach that the linkify engine and pattern matcher are embodied on a client device.” (Office Action of 3/28/07, p. 4.) Although Goodisman provides disclaimers such as, for example, “the Fig. 3 embodiment is provided merely for illustration” (Goodisman, paragraph 0050), Applicants are unable to discern any teachings or suggestion in Goodisman that his linkify engine be embodied in computer readable media of a local computer or be configured to operate on a local computer. Instead, Goodisman teaches that, for example:

Accordingly, the features of the linkify engine 104 can be applied to requests using a variety of communications routes between the clients 42 and the servers 44. ... Additionally and optionally, a request from a client 42 can be submitted to a server 44, and the server 44 can thereafter transfer the processed or unprocessed request to the linkify engine 104. (Goodisman, paragraph 0051.)

The Examiner stated that Goodisman “teaches that it is well-known that the client and server may exist on the same device.” (Office Action of 3/28/07, p. 3, citing Goodisman paragraph 0051.) However, Claim 1, as amended recites a “a computing application *configured to operate on a local computer*, said computing application configured to generate requests to a *remote content server* and receive content from the server”, and “at least one helper object embodied in at least one computer readable medium *of the local computer* and configured to *operate on the local computer*” (emphasis added). Applicants respectfully contend that Goodisman does not teach or suggest the quoted recitations of claim 1.

Embodiment in and operation on a local computer is useful, for example, in reducing the “burden on content servers to perform significant processing when offering associated links” and the “latency between the content request and request fulfillment.” (Pending Application, paragraph 0006.) In the Response to Arguments of the pending Office Action, the Examiner stated: “At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to configure the linkify engine of Goodisman on the client device, providing the benefit of reducing the amount of bandwidth required to process data between a client and a server device.” (Office Action of 3/28/07, p. 3.) Applicants are unable to discern any recognition of bandwidth or latency issues in the disclosures of Goodisman and Subramanian, nor any other reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field to modify the linkify engine of Goodisman to reside on the client device.

For at least the above reasons, applicants submit that claim 1 of the application is in patentably defined over the cited art and is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 1 be reconsidered.

Independent Claim 12 stands rejected for the same reasons as Claim 1. Claim 12, as amended, contains recitations related to a helper object and a recognizer operating on a local computer. Thus, for at least the reasons presented above with respect to Claim 1, Applicants

respectfully submit that Claim 12 is patentably defined over the cited art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 12 be reconsidered.

Independent Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Goodisman in view of Subramanian and U.S. Pub. 2003/0080986 (Baird). For the reasons described above in relation to Claim 1, and because Baird is silent on the issue of a helper object or a recognizer, Applicants contend that the cited references, neither individually nor in combination, teach the method of Claim 21. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 21 is patentably defined over the cited art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 21 be reconsidered.

Claims 2 – 3, 5 – 11, 13 – 20, and 22 - 23 depend, directly or indirectly, from Claims 1, 12, and 21 respectively. Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the reasons explained above with respect to independent Claims 1, 12 and 21, the dependent Claims are patentably defined over the cited art and, accordingly, respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be reconsidered.

Additionally, Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected as allegedly unpatentable over Goodisman in view of Subramanian, as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,222,537 (Smith). Claim 5, as amended, recites in part:

... said helper object further comprises a first listener and a second listener, at least one of said first and second listeners being configured to trigger parsing of received content.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not teach the quoted claim recitation. Goodisman and Subramanian are silent on the issue of first and second listeners. Smith discloses listener objects that function as elements of a **user interface** control object. Smith describes:

In an object oriented environment, an interface control object issues an event to another object which may be a specific component of an application program. The application object is an **event listener which has registered with the interface control** (or with a class from which the specific control inherits)--i.e. the application developer has set the application object **to be informed of interface control object events**. The interface control object is in turn an event **listener for events triggered by user interaction** with views of the control on a GUI. A **second listener for the user interface control** object is the display update object 15 which

provides the **function of passing display data to the display controller**. (Smith, column 8, lines 21-32, emphasis added)

The listeners of claim 5 are components of a helper object that is “configured to operate on the local computer to parse received content locally” (*see* Claim 1). Furthermore, at least one of the helper objects is “configured to trigger parsing of received content” (Claim 5). Thus, for at least these reasons Applicants respectfully contend that Claim 5 is patentably defined over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 5 be reconsidered.

Claim 6 depends from Claim 5 and therefore Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the reasons explained above with respect to Claim 5, dependent Claim 6 is patentably defined over the cited art. Furthermore, Claim 6 recites that the first and second listeners are configured to monitor and be responsive to a top level instance and a child instance respectively of the computing application. The cited references appear to be silent on the issue of listeners configured to monitor top level and child instances of a computing application. For at least these reasons in addition to the reasons described above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 6 is patentably defined over the cited references and request that the rejection of Claim 6 be reconsidered.

New Claim 24 depends from Claim 6 and indirectly from Claim 5. Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the reasons explained above with respect to Claims 5 and 6, Claim 24 is patentably defined over the cited art and, accordingly, respectfully request that Claim 24 be considered for immediate allowance.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-0672/158461.01
Application No.: 09/995,224
Office Action Dated: March 28, 2007

PATENT

Conclusion

As explained above, Applicants submit that Claims 1 – 23, which currently stand rejected in the Application, and new Claim 24 are patentably defined over the cited art. No new matter has been added in amending Claims 1, 5, 6, 7, 10, 12 and 21 and in adding Claim 24. The Examiner is respectfully urged to reconsider the Application. Favorable consideration and passage to issue of the application is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner should, however, find the claims as presented herein are not allowable for any reason or if the Examiner has any questions, comments, or suggestions that would expedite the prosecution of the present case, the Applicants undersigned representative would sincerely welcome a telephone conference at (206) 903-2475.

Date: September 19, 2007

/Kenneth E. Plochinski/

Kenneth E. Plochinski
Registration No. 59,166

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439